following present:

#### SECRET

.... The 146th meeting of the CIA RETIREMENT BOARD convened at 2:15 p.m. on Thursday, 12 November 1970, with the

airman

Member

DI Member

DS&T Member

Member

Jal Advisor

Technical Advisor

Executive Secretary

Recording Secretary

25X1A

We have the Minutes of the Board

meetings on 1 October, 15 October, and 26 October 1970. Any comments on them? (No response.) If not, let them stand as written.

Next we have two employees who have completed 15 years of Agency service and appear to meet the criteria for designation

as participants in the System: 25X1A

Recommend we approve their

designation as participants in the System.

Second.

... This motion was then passed ...

25X1A

We have nine employees who have completed more than 5 years of Agency service and appear to meet the criteria for designation as participants in the System.

Move they be so designated.

Second. 25X1A

This motion was then passed  $\dots$ 

We have one employee - John O.

, who has applied for voluntary retirement on 31 January 1971.

**SECRET**Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-RDP78-03092A000800110002-7

25X1A

CACO. 1 Excluded from automati downgrading and dovinastiveation

He is age 57, has 33 years of Federal service, 19 years of Agency service, and 60 months of qualifying service.

25X1A

Move we approve it.

Second.

. . This motion was then passed . . .

25X1A

25X1A

We have one involuntary retirement -

on 31 January 1971, age 47, 27 years of Federal

service, 10 years of Agency service, and 62 months of qualifying service.

May I have a motion?

25X1A

Move it be approved.

Second.

. . . This motion was then passed . . .

25X1A

. . .

joined the meeting

at this point . . . .

25X1A 25X1A

Next, the case of

I feel very familiar with this case since he has had five extensions, the last two of which were in spite of "there will not be another extension"25X1A although I don't think the very last one was worded that way.

is a fine old gentleman and he is sitting outside and waiting to come in, at his own request. His wife has chronic leukemia and in a sense he is sort of sitting a death watch on her. Each year he feels that she can't possibly make it another year - and he says as soon as she dies he is going back to Arizona and he can live very comfortably on his salary.

And she apparently has been too ill to even contemplate moving to cheaper living quarters. And as he said, he might go from a \$157.00 apartment to maybe a \$125.00 one, but there isn't much available below that, so he

doesn't feel there would be much of a saving and he would probably spend more in moving expenses than for a year in rent, and he doesn't expect her to live this long.

It's really a rather sad case. He has tried to find other work, but at age 66 he obviously is not going to find it. I wouldn't want to put this into anything we write up, but he's really sort of saying whenever his wife dies he will retire.

So, this is where we stand on it.

I should tell you that on this one I did talk to Colonel White and say: I know how the Board is going to feel on this - or at least I think I do, because I think it's a good compassionate case and I think most of them will want to go along with the extension but they will be a little upset on a 6th extension. And he said he didn't think he would have too much trouble with that. So I don't know if 25X1A there is any point, really, in calling lin. 25X1A No. I wouldn't find any trouble 25X1A giving him the extension.

You might let him come in but spare him having to repeat all of what you mentioned.

Does anybody want him to come in?

No, I don't think so.

I don't think so.

Okay, we have recommended a

one year extension for based on the very compassionate circumstances surrounding his entire case.

. . This motion was unanimously passed . . .

25X1A

who is waiting outside to come in.

I realize we have a negative from

25X1A

the CSCS Board and a negative from Division, but yet I don't like it to appear that we take completely what they say when the man's case looks pretty good when you read it. I'm looking for just what is it that makes his own statement of the case 25X1A not the true one, so to speak. I have a call in to , and he said he would have to go back and refresh his memory and then he would call But he hasn't called back yet -- and I'd like to hold off me back. 25X1A bringing in until I've gotten that call. If this case had had a positive endorsement from everybody, it wouldn't have looked bad -- but 25X1A was not as involved in all of these things as he I have a feeling that indicates he was. 25X1A

Did you say he is waiting outside?

Yes.

Let me read the facts on this. He is 52. He needs almost the full 60 months. He had only six days overseas. He has agreed that he will retire within 90 days after approval. Since he is only 52 he would take somewhere around a 6% reduction in annuity under Civil Service if he doesn't make CIARDS. He is specifically requesting the time from July 1962 through October 1967. The Chief of Division 25X1A 25X1A

with Division should be considered as domestic qualifying service for the CIARDS. While it is true tha \$25X1A\$ Mr. It is perform operational assignments utilizing non-official cover he was not required to live in a non-official cover environment where the constant application of stringent cover and security techniques was necessary."

And the CSCS Board reached that same conclusion. He was assigned 25X1A throughout all of this time to the Washington Office of and he was under 25X1A

We did get one comment from Wayne

Wayne said was with him for only one year -- 25X1A but

Wayne drew a real blank - said that as far as he knew was

the historical officer and records administration, and didn't get into the

25X1A

# SECREI

operational aspects. Now maybe he did in the previous four years, but, again, he wouldn't have the full five years.

25X1A

Well, let's move to the case of

is 55 years old.

Just what is here.

The only comment I have here on

From 1946

25X1A

while I wait for to return my call regarding M

25X1A

until December 1950 he was on the Support Staff of OSO, and from 1950 until October 1952 he was in conventional logistics duties. So obviously we are zeroing in on 1955 until 1967 when he was with the Central Cover Staff, and apparently out of that period 1955 through 1958 - three years, and 1965 to 1967 - two years, a total period of approximately five years was in non-official cover.

Sid, do you have anything further to present on this case?

No.

25X1A

My own comment to myself was that on balance it didn't look too bad - particularly as he described it in his 11 September 1970 memo.

25X1A

25X1C

25X1A Yes, that's a rather significant thing.

Now maybe it was just a slip on his part, but it's almost such a bad one that you have the feeling maybe he doesn't know they don't have representation here.

25X1A

Clearly he doesn't know.

5

joined the 25X1A

25X1A

25X1A



meeting at this point . . . .

He is not the first one that we have had whose job was to arrange commercial cover, and to whom we have given credit.

I don't know. Does anyone else have any strong feelings one way or the other on it?

I just can't see it, myself. 25X1A

The nub of it is, his duties involved -

"...the establishment, implementation, and operation of many cover facilities throughout the United States. Required considerable travel as

revealing government interest and the cover entities that were established continued to be maintained and administered with a very limited number of persons being aware of the true nature. This required extensive and constant use of cover and of operational techniques."

I guess our question is to what extent these duties required extensive and constant use of cover and operational techniques.

And did he spend a total of three years in that.

It's three out of five is what they're

saying.

25X1C

Was he on the road more than 60%

of the time?

6

## SEGRET

Some of the things that he brings up 25X1A in his memo just floor me! Like where he talks about representing a business firm and that that was bad because he could have gotten a discount at hotels and motels had he been a Federal employee. 25X1A My thought, Harry, becaus 25X1A you keep looking for / specific period of time, like the period in for instance, how long was that? what was the beginning and the ending date. 25X1A one was cited in his memo as just a fictitious case. 25X1A But in terms of the thing he was supporting, if he could put a beginning and ending date it might even make his case a little easier to follow. 25X1A Well, we have had other Central Cover cases, haven't we, Harry? 25X1A I think so, yes. I mention this fact, that maybe not in first going out and scrounging up commercial cover and making these contacts, but ultimately he has to surface who he is -- I'm sure he doesn't get any CIA cover without ultimately saying - "I'm from the CIA and we would like to plant this guy with you." So it really isn't completely clear to me why he used the cover. I'm sure he didn't sign a hotel register as with CIA -- that is understandable. But it isn't tradecraft and cover in the sense that we normally think of it. It's only until he gets in and talks to somebody, but then he must say to them he's from the CIA. But I do agree with John - I think we have given credit for this type of activity. <sub>I</sub>25X1A I wash't certain that we had. don't know. I think it would be interesting to see if we have ever given any, other than under the liberalized approach.

7

25X1A

But not for establishing non-official

cover, during that first period when he was --

25X1A I'm not even considering the official Because, you see, he is really identifying a twelve cover part of it. year period, out of which it appears five years was under non-official cover, and out of that five years he is looking for three. Also, of course. Tom K. has said this looks like pretty good service. But the non-official cover part 25X1A was only 26 months. "During my second assignment to Then he says, non-official cover staff from January 1965 to March 1967 ...." 25X1A So the one period was for 26 months and the other for 35 months. 25X1A Yes. 25X1A Maybe we should go back to him and ask him how much of his time he was actually out performing that job of establishing non-official cover --25X1A Well, he says at one point -"In this assignment the time away from office and home increased from about twenty percent to nearer twenty five percent of the time." 25X1A Well, 25% of five years is not three years -- this is the problem. And he's an old friend and old schoolmate of mine, but I just don't think he was out that much -- and while he was here he was an Agency employee in this building. 25X1A I think we ought to talk to the man himself or get somebody to come in who was in Central Cover during the 25X1A period was there -- maybe 25X1A 25X1A Yes, Erich could probably give you a clearer story, and much more to the point, also. 25X1A But would Erich know the situation during that period, though. 25X1A Well at least he could dig through

the files and research the thing a little bit.

And he will do his usual thorough 25X1A search, too. I'm bothered because in some cases we get pretty good supporting papers and in others it's inadequate, and I really think we should ask those who are commenting either pro or con As I previously pointed out in 25X1A to say a few more words about it. for example, says in his memo 25X1A the case of is qualified, and then when you match that up that he doesn't think against what the man himself said, you don't feel you really have enough to question the man on. Well, to go back to case. really pushing for this 31 December retirement? do you know, is Well, that's what paragraph 4 in that last memo says. 25X1A I'm sorry I was away for two weeks -because this is the type of thing we should have laid on earlier so that Erich could have been here today. 25X1A if you're going to talk to Harry, I'm wondering if we shouldn't also ask him who has been retired out of that office and gotten qualifying service, and then let's look at their documented situation. 25X1A I think Murray can probably spot that for you. Well, either way -- I think it would be of interest to see how the Board looked at it, and if it was the same sort of criteria - and I think it was. <u>25</u>X1A I know of two and the fellow who went down to Florida and subsequently died. 25X1A about

He was a liberalized one, though 25X1A wasn't he? I don't know. Let Murray look up a couple or three of them. Tom didn't retire until about February 25X1A of this year. We might have given him some credit--We have been giving credit for a lot of the activity, but of course it normally took care of a shorter period of time. This is a pretty extensive period of time -- I think this is our problem here. Well, okay, we will talk to Erich. 25X1A And based on his age and time in service 25X1A could retire under the Civil Service System without a reduced annuity, couldn't he? 25X1A Yes. 25X1A Now, rather than keep waiting out here 25X1A any longer, I'll bring him in now. Before he comes in let me say I've checked here through his Fitness Reports and they kind of reflect 25X1A what says - up until the beginning of January 1967, and from there through to the end of the period he claims, this is more or less what it is: analyzes and drafts reports, monitored daily information, maintained a

register, records management, historical officer -- and that covers the But before that his last year and a half of what was is claiming. Fitness Reports support what he said. 25X1A

Let me give the details to you now,

because I'm going to bring him in shortly. He was case officer for 25X1C responsible for

Agency coordination and support including liaison with the military on Now even that by itself doesn't sound joint utilization of project assets.

all that good. We can ask him a little more about it. 25X1A Then, case officer for responsible for supporting, development and placement of a singleton asset 25X1C This sounds like an R&D project and yo25X1Ain coordination with get a contract for a survey. I don't know. We will have to ask him. Monitoring correspondence --Obviously that's nothing. Then as you move on, as Murray was pointing out --Starting with January 1967 -- 25X1A Beginning January 1967 he was strictly an office type. 25X1A Does know that the CSCS Boar25X1A did not approve it? 25X1A I don't know. If you take that back to January 1967, that leaves him seven months shy right there. 25X1A Shy of 59 months. 25X1A Because July 1962 to Yes. January 1967 --He needed every bit of that, and he 25X1Awas asking for July 1962 to October 1967 -so you've knocked out 10 months of it right there. 25X1A Which would leave him only 53 or 54 months. 25X1A then came before the Board in his own behalf

we have been going 25X1A

through your file a little bit here. First of all, I assume you know that in terms of domestic qualifying service the critical thing we're looking for has to do with the requirement of continuing practice of stringent security and covert tradecraft procedures. We have to very carefully consider this, because otherwise everyone who is engaged in very sensitive activities down the hall here could claim the same thing about their jobs. The key thing is you are out in the field and you really have to practice tradecraft --

were for this.



I think I understand what the criteria

25X1A

Your case is possibly a little more

difficult because of the fact that there is very little overseas service here.

That is correct, except for the three

TDY's connected therewith.

25X1A

So we have to find an awful lot of

domestic service, specifically --

Did you say three TDY's?

25X1A

was thinking of an earlier TDY, which was not connected with this. There was one in 1962. These were short TDY's. 25X1A

In the course of our going into this both by talking with people and by reviewing your file, it just seems to us that quite clearly from January 1967 on you were out of all of this and you were historical officer, records management officer, and by and large in administrative duties.

So even if we went all the way and gave you credit for the entire balance, you still wouldn't have the required amount of service.

I see.

Did you realize that?

25X1A

	25X1A
service covered that period of time. I would have to refresh my memory	
on this. It commenced when I undertook and ceased 2	25X1A 25X1A
when the was being wound up whatever period of	.0/(1/(
time that was, it was the period of time I am referring to in terms of	
continuous operational activity.	
Well, your total time was about	25X1A
63 months in other words, from July 1962 to October 1967 is 63 months	hs.
It seems quite clear that there are only 53 months, though, that can even	
be considered and I think it would be quite difficult to find all 53	
of those months qualifying, but even if we did, you still don't have the	
necessary 60 months.	
expired at what point:	25X1A
mean, I said immediately prior to transfer in November 1967	25X1A 7,
so I guess it was prior to that period of time, then. So it's whatever	
those periods of months might be.	
Well, for example, we've got that	25X1A
specific Fitness Report and it shows no duties other than the more or less	
admin type duties for that whole last ten months.	
L: Starting with January 1967.	25X1A
Now even if you had enough time	
which, as I say, you don't For example, what about your du	ıties
in terms of the surface seems to involve	25X1A
primarily liaison with military components.	25X1A

Next 6 Page(s) In Document Exempt

he was not involved in sensitive projects after 1 January 1967 -- so that we would have to find almost 60 months out of a 53 month period.

request. I move that we do not approve this

25X1A

Second.

. . . This motion was then passed . . .

25X1A

The next case is 25X1A

Why doesn't somebody make the

motion.

25X1A Well, John, I must admit I'm on th25X1C

fence on this one. He was a weapons instructor. How hazardous is this? I wish it was more than five months so you could make the case. This note says to me: just received a call back that the information he had given was wrong. Well, the information I had



25X1A 25X1A But they were using and25X1C that was the reason we got because the neighbors complained to their congressmen about it. 25X1A Right. Again I'm not clear --25X1C Certainly the man doesn't indicate he was in He was an instructor. My question to you is: Do you feel a weapons instructor is qualifying service? I guess it's a question of the odds. In other words, you could say - well, does everybody get a day's credit when he goes down and takes weapons instruction? Obviously this would be pretty silly. This guy is just exposed to it on a daily basis, but is it really that hazardous? I'd like to get some reactions from around this table. 25X1A If I were down there I'd worry about the clowns who would be coming down there for training in that same area there. You never could tell what might happen - just accidentally, I mean -- especially if they are brand new at it, if they are being exposed to it for the first time. As an instructor I assume that he could handle himself, but he couldn't handle the other people there and they are the ones who cause the accidents if they ever do have them. 25X1A How do you feel about it, George? I'm a little doubtful myself. Maybe it's just that I'm a little doubtful today --25X1A Well, we have those sort of days. I'm so delighted with the session and the guidance we've gotten from the Director, but I dont want to swing 180 degrees either, and be completely negative on anybody -- I still would like to give them the benefit of the doubt. 25X1A John, what was your reason for asking for the motion earlier?

Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-RDP78-03092A000800110002-7

25X1C Bob, how do you feel? 25X1A You started off moving me off the fence and now I'm way on the other side and I think he ought to have it. How many months are we looking for here? 25X1A Four or five months. And this is one of the reasons --For just four or five months I'd hate to not give it to him. I move we approve it. Second. 25X1A Any nays? I don't believe it, but I don't guess ... Above motion was then passed . . . 25X1A Murray, when you write it up make it four months and 29 days -- that doesn't sound as bad. Now, this case is annoying. 25X1A 25X1A Table 25X1A Let's table one more time. 25X1A

25X1A

# SECRE

for six25X1A is the guy where they have offered to send him to weeks just to give him his time, but has been saying he can't go because he has domestic problems. But they think he is weakening -and if he will go--As a matter of fact, I told them if they would 25X1A give me a flat statement -- I said this to a very responsible guy -- that he would go by the 31st of March that we would lose the papers for three months. Well, Larry was supposed to call me back but he hasn't done so yet. 25X1A Now, is very much the same. has pledged that he will 25X1A the one month and seven days in a string right now, where he has been for the last month, and he is going to continue on until he gets the necessary service - the one month and seven days there to do it. Okay, then we will sort of lose this one, too. 25X1A We have lost it since September already! Yes, this one was excessive, really. Well, we'll give this one the one more month. I'm sure the seven days are gone already. 25X1A Well, since he's going to get the if you took him out you would have to put him right back in anyway, so we're just saving ourselves some time. 25X1A But as I say, Murray, look for 25X1A him in about a month so we can wrap it up. Couldn't we go ahead and approve it on the assumption that this month and seven days will have been completed. 25X1A He is already up there. The motion will be that the man is on a TDY now which will give him the additional one month and seven days he

needs, and on the assumption that he completes this service we recommend that he be designated a participant in the System.

So move. 25X1A Second.

. . . This motion was then passed . . .

25X1A is looking for

an extension of two years under the Civil Service Retirement System. He is now scheduled for April 30, 1971. There is a little confusion in this paper. Really what happened on this one, 25X1A called me and said he was going to have a session with this fellow and, in an effort to gather the various options he said - "If you don't support him on the one year will you give him 60 days to carry him to 30 June?" And I said sure, if he comes in and says - "I don't need an extension but will you give me 60 days to 30 June" - we will say yes, we will approve it. So there has never been any official change and we are acting on the basis of April 31, and not June. It's a bit of a red herring -- but they did ask, and I did say yes we would. In the meantime--And this fellow is apparently a very sincere guy -he did make an effort with EAA, as I think you can see there, to get a But here's a man who not only is 60 years old but he has one eye Civil Service and his hearing is deteriorating -- and although he took the test and qualified, he obviously is not very likely to find a job. And I'm afraid we have to recognize the fact that that Civil Service list is getting pretty long, these days of lay offs, and the possibility of his getting a job is becoming pretty remote.

On the basis of his having given it a good try for three months, they are now asking for a one year extension. In any event, my own thought is that we go ahead with a one year extension on

the basis of not just his compassionate problem -- because it probably isn't all that great -- but the fact that he does have to continue working and he is in a poor position, really, to have any chance of finding a job somewhere else. At least this was my thought. I don't know.

Charlie, did you do any checking on this one?

No, I just went over the other paper 25X1A

that were up in our office -- and they really don't add anything to this.

extension.

I'm inclined to go along on a year's 25X1A

I'd recommend we approve an extension

for one year.

Second.

This motion was then passed . . .

25X1A 25X1A Next, the case of 25X1A

I talked to our Director of Finance and told him he

was doing a fine job in carrying out the spirit of this thing. And again, I'm throwing this out for what it's worth. This is really not the worst case I've seen, in terms of her having only a \$3900.00 annuity. True, her husband is also getting an annuity, but he is disabled to the extent that he was able to retire on a disability annuity. She does have more than her share of family problems. All I said here in my notes is: Suppose the Board recommends a three month extension to carry her to the end of the year so she at least gets the tax break? -- which always seems to be particularly important to these Finance types who figure all of these things out. And Les Bush said he would certainly have no objection to that. Again, I throw that out as sort of my homework on this particular case. I guess if I had to decide it based on the facts, I think I would have gone along, since the Director of Finance and the

DD/S had both recommended for it. I don't think it's that bad a case.

I have to give Les Bush credit for having a closer feel of the thing. How do you all feel?

long a period?



The D/Pers can approve for how

25X1A

It will have to go to the Director. But

that's all right. It just seems like a little something to give her which will have some meaning -- save her some money on taxes.

Charlie, do you have any feeling on that?

with you, George?

I would agree.

25X1A

Is a three month extension all right

Yes.

Yes.

Okay, I think we have a motion and a

second that we recommend a three month extension, particularly to give her the slight financial break that would result in her tax situation.

. . . This motion was then passed . . .

25X1A 25X1A

Next case,

He

wants domestic qualifying service and will retire 30 April 1971 at age 60 - which would then be mandatory retirement. He needs eight months and

he is looking for that amount of service in the period August 1964

through March 1967, and also 1967 to the present.

Well, all I know is what I read there. He

seemed to be handling a

25X1C

a from the 1967 date on, and

prior to that time was engaged in clandestine meetings with what appears

to be great frequency, all requiring tradecraft and security. So, Sid,

do you have anymore than what is on the surface here?

25X1A

No. I remember this guy when he

was in SR Division, at that time, and he was a very conscientious,

# SEGRET

hard-working guy, and he went off -- I don't remember whether these were the exact dates or not -- but he went to We had a 25X1A 25X1A records program of two to three month TDYs, because the they had down there were vast but had not really been kept in good order for a long time, and he is a linguist of sorts and they needed the and that's why he went down on several of those things. And also, if I'm 25X1A also, again to do the same job of pulling out the not mistaken, to K1C All of this information was there but it had never been pulled out. this guy worked on this in the field and also back here in his headquarters office. I didn't have any trouble with this one. I didn't either. 25X1A It looked pretty good -- and it is just eight months. I move we approve it. I second that. This motion was then passed . . . 25X1A The next case is 25X1A He needs 15 months of domestic qualifying service. He will retire 30 25X1C

Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-Remas -ບວຸບອຂອບບບວບບາ 10002 ນີ້ເປັນໄດ້ ເ Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-RDP78-03092A000800110002-7

25X1C SECRET



25X1A 25X1A

The next case is

She needs 17 months. Possibly this will be down to 13 or 14 months, because apparently she is on a brief TDY now. The plea is on the basis of 1954 to 1957 operations support to field and contract agents.

And that kind of narrows it down. This is the language I have reference to here.

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

by at one time or another. Our conclusion is that has stated her duties in paragraph 2 in an accurate manner and that these

the Headquarters area who presumably required all of the service listed

qualifying service."

Now that's not quite a statement that they think her service is qualifying.

Then has signed a memo for John 25X1A

25X1A saying,

"... we have concluded that during the perio \$\alpha 5X1A\$ May 1954 through May 1955 was essentially performing the duties as outlined in paragraph 2 of her referenced memorandum." "Whether such \$\alpha 5X1A\$ service claimed by \$\alpha 100 \text{ four bounds bould be credited}\$ towards retirement can only be left to the purview of the Retirement Board; however, this Division would endorse a favorable ruling if the Retirement Board is so inclined."

Both of these endorsements are almost damning with faint sort of words, I feel.

Now, I relate these two. I should tell you real well -- for a time socially -- and I guess 25X1AI know I'm closer to what she did. To me both of these cases are about the There is a great similarity. was a secretary or is a secretary in EUR, did all of her overseas service being on the desk here she handled the telephone calls and arranged 25X1A meetings, and if there was going to be a party she might even be in or arranging that but more in a secretarial/admin way with our liaison people here in Washington. For the life of me I just can't see it as qualifying service -- and I really don't think Jane does, but she thought there would be no sense in not trying, because she's going to leave anyway. Her husband has retired and she wants to join him. 25X1A during the period she is claiming was

in admin support, specifically during that period she was admin officer in the Support Branch in the period 1954 to 1956. Again it sounds to me like they used her when they had a language problem who weaker in town, to lay on the arrangements, but she didn't participate operationally. This is the feeling that I have. I don't know how it reads to the rest of you fellows.

It even goes beyond that. Tom K.

says:

"During the above mentioned period,
was engaged in the selection, procurement and cover
arrangements for a safehouse and recruited and handled
a safehouse keeper. She also provided operational
support to field and contract agents during their
temporary visit to Washington, D.C."
25X1A

I'm saying, what was this operational

support? The fact that she laid on the arrangements to get a safehouse?

## SEGRET

All right, I accept that, but I don't see that as a big deal.

They are talking about in Washington 25X1A here. The thing is she was a support type, and I don't think she was involved operationally with these people -- I think she took care of the housekeeping problems for them. 25X1A Guided them around the city and saw to it they had a good time. 25X1A I think here again in all cases they knew who she was. Again, I'd be happy to have her come in and talk to us some more. I don't like to turn people down at this stage of the game unless it's real black and white without talking to them. 25X1A Apparently she won't be back here 25X1A They said the TDY is four months. for two or three months. 25X1A I have a question about 25X1A But on these two cases I didn't have any question -- I just 25X1A couldn't see it here at all. 25X1A Well, to just stick with the case for a minute, how did you feel about it, Charlie? I must say, I had difficulty with it, too. I did too. What did you think, John? I thought it was weak as presented. There may be something here we don't see, but --The thing that bothered me here were the words that they chose - which, as you (indicating say, were damning with faint agreement.

I think they know that it was kind of --

I really think it was very much what Jane

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

**ILLEGIB** 

25X1A

## CLURET

25X1A did. Jane came to see me, and I said - "Jane, what did vou do?" "Well, you know, I made telephone calls and would say -25X1A Can you meet today at the And when they came to the building here she would escort them. These were offic**945**% 1A But when I got down to the heart of it -"Did it really require tradecraft and security?" Not one bit, really. These people knew just who she was. And then Jane would say to me and mean it sincerely, "But when we were at parties together I'd have to be careful what I said." I don't call that "stringent security." 25X1A If you will look on page 10 of your statistical report you will notice the 7th name down on that list is 25X1A She has already signed for discontinued service under Civil Service so she must not think she has much chance here -- she signed to go 28 November 1971 -- she signed her application before she went on TDY. 25X1A Of course she has a lot at stake -it's 10% more for her. Well, three of you feel the same way, then, in 25X1A case. Sid, do you feel strongly about wanting to wait and have her come in? 25X1A Yes, I think so. I think she is a very bright girl -- and I know, also, because she was supporting the 25X1A directly from here - and boy! the flow of necessary documents came up regularly, and well in time, and with comments that she would gather from others. The problem is we will run out of time here. 25X1A She has already signed for the Civil Service in February. From what you're saying, Sid, she 25X1A

may be the greatest in the world, but we are talking about did she really have to practice tradecraft or security? I'm not arguing on that. 25X1A I think we have a motion here. Would you like to make it, Charlie? 25X1A I move that the request for domestic 25X1A qualifying service in the case of be disapproved. Second. 25X1A This motion was then passed . . . 25X1A I think that settles the case, then, too. Yes, I think we have a motion that the request for domestic qualifying service in the case of be disapproved. . . . THis motion was seconded and passed . . . The Board members agreed to have their next meeting on 30 November 1970 . . . The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.